

### REMARKS

Claims 8, 14 and 15 have been amended and claims 1 to 7 and 9 to 13 have been canceled and replaced by new claims 16 to 25. Claims 8 and 14 to 25 are now active in this application.

Objected to claim 5 has been canceled.

Claims 1, 3, 5, 9 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Neustein (U.S. 5,224,150). This rejection is now moot since all of these claims have been canceled.

Claims 2, 4, 6, 7, 10 and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Neustein in view of Grube et al. (U.S. 5,778,304). The rejection is respectfully traversed as to claim 14, the other rejected claims in this grouping having been canceled.

Claims 14 requires, among other steps, the step of providing a short-range base station having a short coverage area relative to the at least one long-range base station and disposed within the coverage area of the at least one relatively long-range base station, the short-range base station controlling all wireless mobile communications to and/or from the at least one relatively long range base station within the short coverage area, the short-range base station restricting operation of communication devices disposed within the short coverage area which are capable of communicating with the at least one relatively long range base station. No such step is taught or suggested by Neustein either alone or in the combination as claimed. Grube et al. does not overcome the deficiencies in Neustein and also fails to teach or suggest the above described step either alone or in the combination as claimed with or without Neustein.

Claim 8 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Neustein. The rejection is respectfully traversed for the reasons presented above with reference to claim 14 since claim 8 contains the same features as claim 14, but is written in structure rather than method format.

Claim 13 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Neustein in view of Ferrara (U.S. 5,422,937). The rejection is now moot since claim 13 has been canceled.

Claim 14 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Grube et al. The rejection is respectfully traversed for reasons presented above with reference to the claim 14 rejection based on Neustein and Grube et al., such reasons being incorporated by reference.

Claim 15 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Grube in view of Stein (U.S. 5,771,468). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 15 depends from claim 14 and therefore defines patentably over the applied references since Stein fails to overcome the deficiencies in Grube et al. as noted above.

In addition, claim 15 further limits claim 14 by requiring that the step of controlling wireless communications be provided in more than one format on more than one channel. No such combination is taught or suggested by Grube et al., Stein or any proper combination of these references.

Claims 16 to 20 depend from claim 8 and therefore define patentably over the applied references for at least the reasons presented above with reference to claim 8.

In addition, claim 16 further limits claim 8 by requiring that the communication devices include means responsive to the short range base station for providing at least one

predetermined function at the communication devices. No such combination is taught or suggested by any of the cited references taken singly or in any proper combination.

Claim 17 further limits claim 16 by requiring that the at least one predetermined function be one of precluding audible responses at the communication devices, causing a response to be converted from an audible response to a non-audible response and altering predetermined types of communications from the communication devices to the long range base station. No such combination is taught or suggested by any of the cited references taken singly or in any proper combination.

Claim 18 further limits claim 17 by requiring that the at least one predetermined function be precluding audible responses at the communication devices. No such combination is taught or suggested by any of the cited references taken singly or in any proper combination.

Claim 19 further limits claim 17 by requiring that the at least one predetermined function be causing a response to be converted from an audible response to a non-audible response. No such combination is taught or suggested by any of the cited references taken singly or in any proper combination.

Claim 20 further limits claim 17 by requiring that the at least one predetermined function be altering predetermined types of communications from the communication devices to the long range base station. No such combination is taught or suggested by any of the cited references taken singly or in any proper combination.

Claims 21 to 25 depend from claim 14 and therefore define patentably over the applied references for at least the reasons presented above with reference to claim 14.

In addition, claim 21 further limits claim 15 by requiring that the communication devices include means responsive to the short range base station for providing at least one predetermined function at the communication devices. No such combination is taught or suggested by any of the cited references taken singly or in any proper combination.

Claim 22 further limits claim 21 by requiring that the at least one predetermined function be one of precluding audible responses at the communication devices, causing a response to be converted from an audible response to a non-audible response and altering predetermined types of communications from the communication devices to the long range base station. No such combination is taught or suggested by any of the cited references taken singly or in any proper combination.


Claim 23 further limits claim 22 by requiring that the at least one predetermined function be precluding audible responses at the communication devices. No such combination is taught or suggested by any of the cited references taken singly or in any proper combination.

Claim 24 further limits claim 22 by requiring that the at least one predetermined function be causing a response to be converted from an audible response to a non-audible response. No such combination is taught or suggested by any of the cited references taken singly or in any proper combination.

Claim 25 further limits claim 22 by requiring that the at least one predetermined function be altering predetermined types of communications from the communication devices to the long range base station. No such combination is taught or suggested by any of the cited references taken singly or in any proper combination.

In view of the above remarks, favorable reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Jay M. Cantor  
Attorney for Applicant(s)  
Reg. No. 19,906

Texas Instruments Incorporated  
P. O. Box 655474, MS 3999  
Dallas, Texas 75265  
(301) 424-0355 (Phone)  
(972) 917-5293 (Phone)  
(301) 279-0038 (Fax)